



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Amended TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

**PLEASE NOTE: This meeting can be viewed in a live webcast of Madison City Channel at
www.madisoncitychannel.com.**

Wednesday, May 29, 2013

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)
(After 6 PM, use Doty St. entrance.)

Please note: The Minutes were amended to add a comment to Golden's remarks on page 5.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM.

Present: 6 -

Sue Ellingson; Chris Schmidt; Anita Weier; Gary L. Poulson; Margaret Bergamini and Kenneth Golden

Excused: 3 -

David E. Tolmie; Amanda F. White and Ann E. Kovich

Please note: Schmidt arrived at 5:03 PM, after the Minutes were approved.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Golden, seconded by Bergamini, to Approve the Minutes of the April 10, 2013 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other, with Ellingson and Weier abstaining.

C. PUBLIC APPEARANCES - None.

D. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None.

E. TRANSIT AND PARKING QUARTERLY REPORTS

E.1. [30049](#)

Parking: April 2013 Activity Report, March Revenue-Expenses-Occupancy Reports, and Incidents Data - TPC 05.29.13

Parking Operations Manager Tom Woznick reviewed Revenues and Occupancies, Operating Expenses and Operating Bottom Line in the April 2013 Activity Report, and made the following additional comments.

- Capital costs through March were relatively small; however large projects were coming up this summer. Remediation in the structures was being estimated to cost \$623K.
- LED lighting was being tested in State St Cap for potential upgrades. LED lighting was becoming more affordable, which could increase efficiencies if Parking converted to it.
- The new 3-year contract for engineering consultant services was awarded to JSD Professional Services, Parking's current contractor.

- An overview of Incidents in Parking facilities had been attached to the reports. A problem with the data was that the Police captured it by address; incidents may happen on the street but got assigned to the garage nearest it, making it difficult to detail what was actually happening inside the garages. Staff was working with JBM Security to compile info that looked more closely at incidents inside the garages on a weekly or monthly basis. Many of these incidents involved JBM interacting with customers, to help them or to do a check. The incidents in the graphs were those where JBM contacted the Police and were the result of Police reports.

Golden/Bergamini made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

E.2. [30041](#)

Metro: YTD Performance Indicators-Fixed & Paratransit, Financials & Performance Measures, Rider-Revenue-Fare Type Comparisons, Feedback Summary, and Hybrid Statistics - TPC 05.29.13

Metro Transit General Manager Chuck Kamp highlighted the following items in the reports (attached).

- Fixed route ridership thru March was down slightly (0.7%), driven by the timing of Spring break, which was in March for both UW and MMSD. (April numbers showed ridership up by 0.6%.) Also, February 2012 had an extra day for Leap Year.
- Chargeable and preventable accidents were down. Non-chargeable accidents (where other vehicles hit buses) were up, likely due to a challenging winter.
- Inspections were on track.
- Route 84 was the most productive route, at a 112 rides/hour.
- Though ridership has dropped slightly, productivity was up 2.5%.
- With UW Campus routes cut by 10%, when Route 80's were taken out, ridership was up 2.1%, and productivity was up 3.9%.
- Overall, Fixed ridership was in good shape.
- Paratransit ridership was down. Passenger Accidents and Road Calls were down.
- Pointing out YTD %'s for Metro Direct and contractors, Late Service Reports/1000 were down overall; and On-Time Performance for all providers at 91-96% was very good.
- 1st Quarter Financials: Current estimate of Reserves generated was \$155K. If this positive trend continued, Reserves would gradually build up, per Metro's Long Term Plan.
- Both revenues and expenses were on the correct side of the ledger. With underlying ridership positive, Passenger Revenues were up, and over budget. On the Expense side, savings occurred in Salaries and Benefits, and Paratransit.
- Overall, 1st Quarter Financials were in good shape.
- They were continuing to manage vacancies. And while OT was over budget, it was down \$33K vs. 2012. Regular salaries were under budget. A record amount of training continued into early 2013.
- Re: recent reports of top salaries at Metro in 2012, these were driven by record level of retirements and other employee separations – double the amount of a typical year. So in 2012, they had higher levels of OT. This was beginning to come down, but was not at an average rate yet.
- Ways they were controlling OT included adjusting how OT was distributed; additional driver positions slotted to Metro provided more flexibility to help deal with various types of absenteeism (inc. FMLA); and contractual changes whereby employees off for disciplinary reasons due to attendance, now had

working suspensions.

- All of these had helped drop the top rate by a third.
- Performance Measures were common ratios by which transit systems were measured.
- Fixed vs. Paratransit Operating Cost/Trip: For fixed routes, once a bus was out on the street, any additional ride created no additional cost. Whereas, for paratransit, every additional ride was an additional cost, which was typical across the transit industry.
- Operating Cost/Revenue Hours was up by about \$6, driven by health insurance and WRS costs, and snow removal, which was unusually high in the early part of 2013.
- Platform Hours dated back to streetcar days, when any of the hours the operator was on the platform of the streetcar would count as a platform hour.
- Non-platform hours were during pre- or post-trip inspections, or when drivers were standing by or were not on the bus. This was why revenue hours and platform hours varied.
- Revenue Hours did not include Platform Hours when buses were dead-heading. By contrast, Revenue Hours were when drivers were on the bus in revenue service. At the end of the day, when a driver was dead-heading, it was a Platform Hour, but was not a Revenue Hour. These reflected different ways of calculating transit ratios.
- Fixed Route Passenger Revenue was up \$90K.
- Fixed Route Rides: Though total rides for the 1st quarter had dropped slightly, Cash/Ticket/Pass and Unlimited Pass rides were up. The drop in total rides was driven by the cuts to UW Route 80's service. However, underlying ridership was increasing.
- Fixed Route Revenue was up 3%, while Fixed Route Rides were down 0.7%.
- Customer Feedback: Comments in the 1st quarter 2013 were up by 300 vs. 2012. Of these, 180 inputs were in the area of Fixed Route, more than half the total increase. Item 7, "Customer passed up" at 115, was the largest category of all; and had to do with overcrowding on buses. Planning had the second most comments at 151, driven by 72 inputs related to service changes. These two areas = 250 out of 300 total increase.
- Compliments were up 50%.
- NAR = "Not Assigned Responsibility": Using video or automated vehicle locator system, they could determine whether the driver was responsible. Of the total for #7, "Customer passed up", they could definitively say 56 were due to overcrowding or some other reason for which the driver was not responsible. For the other 59, it was either the driver's responsibility or staff could not make a determination. This info was used in counseling employees on performance or in responding to customers.
- Hybrid stats: Miles/gallon were improved over regular buses, and Costs/mile were lower.

Golden requested stats for Passengers/Revenue Hour. Since Paratransit had peaking characteristics, this info could be important, to the extent that this service could maybe be made into a route rather than a taxi. Kamp said that WisDOT used similar stats to compare peer communities; and though WisDOT hadn't done this lately, they could request the most recent comparison. Bergamini asked if a glossary of transit terms could also be provided, to help new members get familiar with such terms as revenue vs. platform hours.

Golden/Schmidt made a motion to receive the report. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**F.1. [30050](#)**

Parking: Presentation by Walker Parking Consultants regarding the Parking Utility Financial Sustainability Study - TPC 05.29.13

Woznick introduced Walker Parking Consultants Phil Baron, Project Manager, and Phill Schragal, Director of Operations Consulting, and provided an overview.

- In September 2011, Parking began looking into hiring a consultant to perform a financial sustainability study for the Utility, the goal being to uncover the strengths/weaknesses of existing economic and operational functions, and make recommendations to the Utility to continue to operate efficiently as an Enterprise Fund for the next 20 years.
- The Utility had an aging infrastructure: Gov East was 55 years old, State Street-Lake and State Street Cap foundation were 50 years old, and Cap Sq North was 42 years old. State Street-Frances and Overture were 30 years.
- There was a 20-year window for replacement of some kind at all of these structures.
- The consultants had begun meeting with City staff and key stakeholders.

Baron and Schragal provided some background about themselves and the study.

- Baron had 15 years experience both nationally and internationally on parking projects that ranged from issuing 2.5+ billion in parking-related debt, to operating studies that looked at revenue-optimization models for parking systems, municipal systems that were looking to grow or that have impending infrastructure challenges, and how to address them. Schragal has 30+ years of municipal parking experience, with a focus on operations; while Baron focused more on the financial elements. They had worked on projects similar to this in the past.
- The goal of the study was to put together a plan that looked at the Utility's operations and revenue and expense-reduction opportunities, funding alternatives and methods of funding (inc. public/private partnerships and different sources of funding), phasing of re/development and how that coincided with revenue, to provide options to decision-makers, so they could weigh the policy decisions and see what the enumerated impact would be and how the options aligned with the Utility's mission.
- They would look at ways to help the Utility run more efficiently from the perspective of the private sector.
- They were sensitive to the local characteristics and demographics, and the wide variety of users of the parking system. They would look at the University, the State, the City, and would meet with developers, restaurant owners, merchants, all with varying needs.
- They had already spent time with focus groups, and had heard about the realities of parking. Many people were riding bikes and using alternate modes of transportation, which was encouraged and highly utilized in the community, different than others.
- People were choosing other modes, whether it was because parking was priced higher, a lack of availability, or for reasons of personal choice. They respected that this segment had needs, inc. parking for bikes or scooters.
- Parking was not solely for vehicles, something to be considered when looking at future capital improvement projects and how this played into capital needs.
- Their timeline was three months, mid to late August.

- The study would not be so much about supply and demand, as it would be creating a matrix of replacement costs based on the work of their structural team. They would look at revenue and expenses, and look at ways to enhance the net, and determine what the Utility would need to use of reserves and what would have to come out of pocket to maintain the system over the next 20 years.

Golden outlined four issues that he hoped the study would cover.

- One option he wanted considered was the sale of one of the Lake-Frances ramps. Though not necessarily favoring this, in looking at the recent utilization of that facility and the cost of replacement, not having to replace one of them might be a good thing. Along with the revenues from the sale would be the reduction of PILOT money and the corresponding potential in new property taxes.
- He wanted the study to look at the different types of debt that the Utility might utilize. One type of debt had a low interest rate, but tied the Utility's hands in terms of the flexibility it had, for example, to offer a larger amount of targeted monthly parking.
- Historically, street meters had subsidized the ramps. Fees were not charged at street meters after 6 PM. Yet when he attended evening events, he observed spaces at street meters were filled. He wondered how this was handled in other communities, and where Madison stood among them.
- The concept of "downtown" had traditionally been defined as the area between Blair Street and Park Street (or if some of the Campus was included, to Randall Avenue). As plans and development occurred, "Greater Downtown" might include more of the E. Washington Avenue corridor further east and Park Street corridor further south, and he wondered if these were areas where the Utility could potentially provide some service. Without knowing what the new zoning code required, he wondered if the study could look at the potential for future parking facilities in these areas; or possibly with Park and Rides, the potential for facilities at the edge of these areas, so that people coming into town would have some linkage between Parking and Metro. A "Park Once" approach should be considered.

Baron responded as follows.

- Their analysis would break out Parking's portfolio by asset, to show which were the more profitable facilities and those that were being subsidized, which would provide an order of magnitude. With this and info about net for each property, they would show the repair and maintenance costs in the near future, to be able to see which property may be a poor performer and wasn't likely to recoup the cost over a long period of time.
- They would be providing this info to City staff, including Woznick and the Directors of Finance and of Economic Development. They wouldn't advise about selling properties, but the info should be very clear and allow people to make decisions.
- They would look at variable debt options.
- Re: on-street meters and timing, they knew of communities which were considering extending their hours of enforcement into the evening hours to add revenues they might be losing. Evening rates needn't be exorbitant, but did provide some recognition of value during that time. These communities were discussing who would be impacted, inc. residents, who returned in the evening, when demand for restaurants also arose.
- Re: the study area and burgeoning growth beyond the core area: They were aware of the issue with Park and Ride's and how to disperse the demand and

give options. They believed a functioning parking system provided choices; it didn't mandate one thing or another, but provided economic choices. If someone felt they could save money, and they had money to park and the time to ride, they would have that choice. If time was a premium and someone wanted to pay to park next to their workplace, there was a value to that also.

Baron said they would be looking at a couple different operating scenarios. The Utility was already doing many good things. It had value pricing at its facilities, inc. valuing on-street parking higher than off-street parking. These concepts were non-existent in many communities, which set the same rates at all facilities, to make it easier to manage. Communities would sometimes try to build their way out of a challenge, rather than manage their way into higher utilization of their facilities. For the Utility, supply was available; now it was a question of looking at ways to maximize the supply. Their analysis would combine the financial and operational elements, getting the checks/balances from those who lived it on a daily basis.

Bergamini appreciated Golden's points, which added some specificity about what they needed to know to make decisions going forward. Re: expanding the concept of downtown, supply/demand was not necessarily in contiguous areas. We needed to also consider existing Park and Rides, or other areas with employment or activity density, which we might not be serving well, or where there were opportunities to capture better revenue, better land use, etc.

Bergamini asked how many years of historical data they planned to use for the study. Madison was the land of summer construction, which at times had had massive impacts on ramp utilization rates. Using one to three years of data might skew utilization rates. Baron said they were planning to use three years of data, but having raised this point, they would talk more about anomalies in the past, which they likely wouldn't model. But maybe there were trends too; maybe during certain times of the year, there were lulls in revenue. The model in their revenue projections would take seasonal trends into consideration from facility to facility.

Bergamini was reminded of the impact on Parking facilities of the UW and Madison College providing bus passes to faculty/students. State Street Campus and State Street Capitol were both hugely affected. Data was readily available that reflected these events. Baron said this was good to know, but from what they had heard, these passes were likely to continue. Certainly, events like this would be discussed in developing their assumptions, but in making 20-year projections, they tried to stay away from anomalies. If they learned of policies that might change, they would model a scenario where that was suggested. Regarding seasonal trends like construction, they would look at annual revenue by facility, and would take any anomalies into account.

Baron said they tended to be conservative in their analysis and projections. For example, if rates were going to go up, elasticity had to be built in. Just because revenues might go up didn't mean demand would be held constant. Customers made choices at some point when rates got to a certain level. This would be spelled out in the analysis.

Baron said they wanted their report to be sort of a tutorial, esp. for people unfamiliar with the Utility. It would contain the history of the Utility, the financial performance, the assets that were within the Utility, and historical rate

adjustments. This would be interesting because many times rates didn't keep up with expenses; and any private sector business wouldn't operate that way. When margin compression was shown, and then impending debt, people became aware that something needed to be done and doing nothing really wasn't an option. The Utility was a valuable asset to many businesses downtown and the community, and maintaining it was important; as well as doing it with a sensitivity towards prices and the realities of restaurant workers and attorneys, and other users with varying degrees of acceptability of rates.

Baron said the goal of the study was to present options to the Commission and other decision-makers. The next phase would be policymaking; looking at all the options and figuring out how to achieve financial sustainability with the least amount of negative impact on various groups. And while trying to serve as many needs as possible, some hard choices about the Parking Utility would need to be made in the near future in order to meet the debt obligations.

Ellingson remarked that in discussion with others, the question was raised as to why the City was in the parking business. Though she didn't have a position on this, she hoped the report would allow them to consider that question, whether they should just get out of the parking business.

Baron said this was a good question that many cities were asking. Aging infrastructure put a burden on budgets. Parking was not as profitable as people thought it was. An open structure had maintenance and labor requirements, insurance and utility costs. To break even on a parking facility, each stall had to bring in \$200/month, short-term and monthly together (assuming an initial cost of \$20K/stall, at 5.5% over 20 years). In thinking about the rates being charged in Madison now, and how important on-street parking was to offset the off-street parking costs, municipal parking systems functioned well because they could leverage on-street parking revenue.

Another question to ask: If parking were very profitable, would private sector be doing it? Yes. But do we see many people rushing to Madison to build free-standing parking structures as investments? No. Except for New York or Chicago, very few were in that business. Parking had historically been a subsidized infrastructure to help with economic development. It was becoming more burdensome for municipalities, some of which were looking to monetize their assets. But there were problems with this too. Recent examples showed that when a city monetized their assets, this gave concessionaires the opportunity to bring rates up to whatever the market would bear because they were in it for profit. This could be a shock to the system and could bring economic activity to a standstill, if the community didn't have the mass to weather that change.

Baron said many issues had to be considered when a city exited parking. Liquidating certain properties to make their model more efficient was definitely something cities were looking at. They had just worked with a city where they turned off the lights and shut down a garage because they couldn't run it. They walked away from it; it was empty. That was not what a city wanted, a blighted block face. Cities were making hard decisions about parking facilities; they were consolidating, or deferring maintenance (kicking the problem down the road).

The good news was that the Utility was in a good financial position currently.

And they would lay out opportunities on the revenue and expense side, a menu of options, some of which would be easy to accept and some would be tough choices. Their goal was to present the facts; the study would not be geared to one specific objective. It would ask how to optimize revenue while being sensitive to the community, and allow the Utility to service the debt for the improvements. One answer might be to stagger the debt, and not be as aggressive as some would like; paying for what we can when we can.

Golden thought the report should have some discussion about other parking providers. He mentioned public entities: Monona Terrace, UW ramps, and the County; and privates like Block 89. He thought these should be inventoried, perhaps with the help of the Assessor and Planning.

Baron reiterated that the core focus of the study would not be a supply/demand analysis, but that they would need to understand utilization in the downtown, esp. of Parking's system, and how these two worked together. Not only might there be an opportunity for the Utility to increase demand in areas where there was a shortage; but also embedded policies impacted the rate these other providers charged. For example, there were reasons why the State charged a relatively low rate of \$31 - \$100 per month. This was the context and market in which the Utility operated. Government-subsidized parking suppressed the rates in communities. The goal of the study was a sustainability plan, and they needed to be sensitive to the market.

Golden mentioned how shocked he was by current utilization data in contrast to the years he had served previously. The economy had something to do with it; and he knew there was a higher vacancy rate in office buildings. Using just three years of data raised a concern, though perhaps the future was this. But parking in the past was much more robust. Schragel said this pattern was true throughout the parking industry. Parking revenues remained stable because rates continued to rise to maintain revenue streams; but the actual parking volume had declined. The garages that were sold in Chicago were not doing nearly the numbers they were projected to do. Looking at utilization data for the previous ten years, volume had declined every year, but revenue gradually increased because they were able to bring rates closer to market. The buyers came in thinking that not only would the volume level off, they'd get a huge uptick to really get to market because they were priced undermarket when they bought them. They got the prices up, but the volume went down.

Golden said he didn't want to make a mistake and sell a facility when utilization was down, only to find out later it was needed. Bergamini agreed with Golden and remarked on the big drops in utilization at such locations as the State Street ramp, which had fallen from 85% to 50%, some of which was due to UW building facilities, but was even more due to Madison Metro's success. Bergamini mentioned the University's current effort to begin a new Master Plan for the campus, which would include a stand-alone Transportation Plan. The previous Master Plan had had a big impact on the city and the community, because as a land-use issue, they decided to go from surface parking to structured. She wanted the consultants to be aware of the Transportation Plan and long-range plans for pricing, mass transit and scooters/bicycles. It was a topsy-turvy world in such areas as real estate development, state budget, etc.

Schragel said they would be taking a conservative approach. An elasticity factor would be built into the study, which would probably drag the volumes

down because he thought this was the way things would trend.

Poulson thanked Baron and Schragel for the info. Woznick said they would probably return later in the summer, and he would provide updates until then.

F.2. [29866](#)

Relating to 2013-2015 Taxicab Operators' License Renewals, pursuant to Section 11.06, Madison General Ordinances.

Poulson noted that the following registrants had indicated their support of the resolution and were available for questions: Phil Anderson of Green Cab, John McNamara of Union Cab, and Greg Morrison of Transit Solutions.

Traffic Engineering Transportation Analyst Keith Pollock discussed the review process, and provided interesting highlights and Traffic Engineering's recommendation for the 2013-15 renewals. (Please see attached reports.)

- The renewals involved four traditional taxi companies: Madison Taxi, Badger Cab, Green Cab and Union Cab; and two specialized transportation service providers, which contracted with Metro to provide paratransit service: Badger Bus and Transit Solutions. Metro wanted their paratransit providers to go through the licensing and legislative process, in which drivers received background checks like cab drivers.

- A database was kept of customer complaints about drivers. Over the two years, no driver received more than one complaint.

- The Police Department tracked crash reports, to identify any drivers who were systematically cited for driving dangerously, or for accidents that involved drugs/alcohol. None were found.

- Insurance coverage was reviewed by the City Risk Manager.

- Each vehicle listed in the applications was reviewed to make sure it was correctly registered with the State. Because the applications reflected a snapshot in time, there was a small snafu. Vehicles were always being put on/taken off the road for various reasons, and DMV was slow in updating its online records. But the companies were able to submitted receipts that reconciled discrepancies.

- Other items reviewed: Vehicle maintenance process, driver rest periods, customer/driver complaints, driver safety operations, refusal of service. (Please see the attached table for demographic and financial info.)

- Union Cab purchased Sun Prairie Taxi in January, which is a shared-ride service within Sun Prairie subsidized by the City. Generally, operations were separate from Madison, unless a taxi broke down, and Union vehicles were needed in Sun Prairie.

- Green Cab began allowing passengers to choose between a direct-ride or a shared-ride service. Similarly, Badger Cab began offering a direct-ride service.

- The metered companies believed this provided an unfair advantage to zone cabs. It could be a little confusing if passengers didn't know if they were going to pay the direct or the shared rate. Zone companies argued that they allowed customers to make their decision before the ride began.

- There were probably more complaints at the airport than there should be.

The airport was the only place where metered companies could split rides (offer shared rides), at 9 PM or other peak periods (as declared by the City or the Airport), usually when students returned or over holidays. During this time, metered cabs could charge by zones and operated by that system. Sometimes, when the drivers weren't supposed to split load, they did. Having received the most complaints, Madison Taxi was trying to crack down on this, with "secret shoppers" and a Quality Control staff working on it.

- The recommendation was to renew the licenses of all six companies.

Pollock answered questions. Green Cab and Badger have the same zone structure. The zone structure for the metered cabs was reviewed every ten years, which was done a few years ago. Regarding continuing problems around the airport, staff had had many meetings, with Airport officials and with the companies, and tried to clear up the issue. Companies also tried to self-regulate. A "Customer Bill of Rights" had been posted at the Airport, to inform people of the difference between metered and zoned service. A "Taxicab Summit" was going to be held shortly.

Bergamini asked about the driver-owned vehicle(s) shown for Madison Taxi. Pollock said that Madison Taxi had one vehicle, which was co-owned by Owner Joe Brekke and the driver, that was insured through the company. Madison Taxi General Manager Rick Nesvacil discussed the arrangement further. The company was responsible for every fee. The insurance, license and permit were in the company's name. The owner just paid the company a dispatch fee; anything above that was hers. The owner was like an independent contractor, but the company had control of it. She used the same rate structure as all the other Madison Taxis. This arrangement was grandfathered in, over the past 20 years. The company was honoring the arrangement because it was the last one of its kind (having had 4-5 such arrangements years ago).

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Ellingson, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.3. [29868](#)

Relating to 2013-2015 Pedal-Cab License Renewals, pursuant to Section 11.06, Madison General Ordinances.

Pollock said that two pedal cabs were renewing their licenses: Capitol Pedalar, and il Corvo. Both had the proper insurance. Ped/Bike Coordinator Arthur Ross had inspected them, and found they had the proper lights and brakes. The recommendation was to renew the two licenses. Pollock also mentioned that a pedal cab in Milwaukee wanted to be able to serve alcohol, and that current State law said the local municipality would have to approve this. This issue might make things interesting in the future. Bergamini noted that the idea of serving alcohol had been brought up at the Commission previously when pedal cabs were initially set up. Though the company didn't pursue the idea at the time, the issue could come up again.

A motion was made by Weier, seconded by Schmidt, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.4. [29542](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5337 State of Good Repair Formula public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

Poulson asked that Items F.4. and F.5. be considered together. Both dealt with Metro applications for public transit capital grants with the U.S. government. Kamp said that in the past, the State of Good Repair had been a discretionary grant. A key feature of MAP-21 was to greatly reduce discretionary funding; they would see more formula grants in the future. This was a concern because

Metro was receiving less funding out of formula than they did when they could use discretionary grants. MAP-21 was only a 2-year authorization bill, and they hoped the issue would be addressed the next time. Meanwhile, they anticipated some challenges because of the smaller dollar amount. Otherwise, the items were routine.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Weier, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F.5. [29555](#)

Authorizing the Transit General Manager to file an application for a Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Formula public transit capital grant with U.S. Department of Transportation and authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the associated grant agreement with USDOT and the associated 13 (c) agreement with Teamsters Local No. 695.

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Weier, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

G.1. [30042](#)

Metro: Deliberations and action on proposed service changes slated for August 2013 - TPC 05.29.13

Poulson invited registrants to speak first, followed by updates from Metro.

Registrant Debbie Lynn Aldrich, N. Segoe Road, 53705 spoke in opposition to eliminating Routes 14/15 service to Sheboygan Avenue, and to eliminating certain bus stops on Middleton Routes 70, 71, 72, 74. A lot of students and senior citizens used the Route 14/15 service. She herself had often used the Segoe-University Middleton bus stop the previous winter. Eliminating these stops would make them few and far between, and make it rough in the winter especially.

Registrant James Aldrich, N. Segoe Road, 53705, spoke in opposition to taking Routes 14/15 off Sheboygan Avenue. A lot of people in the nursing homes on Segoe Road (Independent Living/Segoe Gardens) took the bus. Without this service, these people would have trouble getting to concerts, downtown, and around the city. And it was hard for the disabled to get over to University Avenue. With the current Routes 2, 14 and 15, if a handicapped person missed one of these, s/he could catch another and still get downtown. Regent Street, where the proposed Route 14/15 would travel, was too far away.

District 10 Alder Maurice Cheeks supported Plan B for the Route 18.

- He recognized that the City was struggling to keep up with increased ridership, and ideally, the City would add more buses, but wasn't in a position to do so right now.
- The proposed Route 18 would simplify service by removing the stops along Red Arrow Trail and Crescent Road. But, many of the neighbors in the area relied on Route 18 for work, school and grocery shopping. They would have to go twice as far for their stops.
- In response to the feedback at the Hearing on the proposed Route 18 changes, Metro staff responded with an alternate proposal, Plan B (attached).
- Plan B would not remove service from Crescent/Red Arrow, and would alter

the timing from 30 minutes to 40 minutes, between 4 and 6 PM.

- Naturally, the community would prefer to receive more reliable service without any changes to the Route, but a 10-minute adjustment to the service was better than reducing the stops.
- Plan B was developed by Metro, and supported by the Mayor of Fitchburg and himself. The neighbors were encouraged that Plan B existed, and would like the Commission to support it. He urged members to amend the proposal to support Plan B, and maintain service through the Allied-Dunn's neighborhood.

Kamp and Metro staff, Drew Beck and Mick Rusch, discussed the Sheboygan Avenue and Route 18 issues, and provided a summary of what all the changes would cost.

- With reference to the summary document, "Madison Costs for 2013 Improvements" (attached), the Council approved \$150K in the 2013 budget, and the TPC added \$60K through targeted fare changes, for a total of \$210K. The current proposals totaled \$213K.
- In Metro's current budget, they played with about 80 hours for extra buses. In the proposal, they would still have 50 hours of extra trips, for a total of 1337 service hours on an average weekday.
- The map (attached) of the Paratransit boundaries showed that new service to the Owl Creek area would make it eligible for paratransit service on weekends. This would be the only change (extension) to the Paratransit boundary. On weekdays, the Route would operate only in the AM and PM peaks, and therefore would not be eligible for paratransit. This would be a fairly minor impact.
- The chart of "Weekday Hours Comparison" (attached) showed the +/- change in daily hours between current and proposed service.
- Route 2 would have a 21-hour increase per day. The frequencies would go from 30 minutes to 15 minutes, doubling the frequency in the AM and PM peaks, which would be expanded slightly, running to 10:30 AM and starting up at 2:30 PM.
- Routes 9 and 10: Sort of circulator between Johnson/Gorham corridor, Jennifer Street corridor, and the UW Campus, these would be pulled west all the way to Sheboygan Avenue. They would fill in the gaps left by the Routes 14/15; and would have 15-minute frequency to/from Sheboygan Avenue to Campus and east. It hadn't been fully explained earlier that the 9/10 would be pulled out to Sheboygan to fill in.
- In the AM, a lot of 9/10 trips were going to start out empty on Sheboygan and head towards Campus with lots of seats and standing room, vs. a 14/15 coming through already full of neighbors from further west. The span of service for 9/10 would encompass the AM peak, midday, PM peak, and run well into the evening (to 9:30 PM). It would essentially be an all-day route, which would ramp us during the peaks and midday.
- Service to UWH would run opposite the commute to the Campus; taking people from the east to the Hospital in the AM, and go on to Sheboygan Avenue, where it would start out more or less empty and come back in to Campus. Route 2 would have more frequency to the Hospital, so Route 10 could come back to Campus on Campus Drive and provide a quicker commute.
- Referring to the bar graph Hand-out showing Westbound/Eastbound trips to/from Sheboygan Avenue in hourly increments (attached), more scheduled service was being added to Sheboygan Avenue, as follows:

EASTBOUND

- * 5-6 AM: Stayed the same.
- * 6-7 AM: Two fewer trips at 6 AM. (Had few comments on this.)

- * 7-8 AM: Would have more trips, with Rt. 10 starting out empty on Sheboygan, providing extra capacity and helping with overcrowding.
- * All remaining hours until 8 PM: Would have more trips, with the Route 10 playing a key role.
- * 8-10 PM: Stayed the same.
- * 10-11 PM: One less trip.
- * 11P-12A: Stayed the same.
- * Extras would hopefully be used less in the AM, but 50 hours would still be available to lend flexibility if needed.

WESTBOUND

[from UW Campus = University & Frances; with more frequency on Route 2 from the Square]

- * 5-6 AM: Stayed the same.
- * 6-7 AM: Two fewer trips (based on ridership data).
- * All remaining hours until 8 PM: Would have more trips.
- * 8-10 PM: Stayed the same.
- * 10-11 PM: One less trip.
- * 11P-12A: Stayed the same.
- * Extras would hopefully be used less in the PM, but 50 hours would still be available to lend flexibility if needed.
- Route 10 would have scheduled 8-minute frequencies during the rush hours, to spread out the loads. If buses were overcrowded, riders could wait a few minutes and get the next one.
- The use of Extras was dynamic, based on need at various locations at any given time.
- Returning to "Weekday Hours Comparison", Route 28 would gain 4.5 hours/day. New Route 31 would have 8 hours/day, with the Routes 34 and 39 losing 2 hours each. Route 31 would now serve a lot of the area on the current Route 39, in the Ag Drive area.
- Routes 34 and 39 would share a bus during the peak; the Rt. 34 would be down a bus, but it now would be timed to coincide with the class times at MATC.
- The net increase in service hours/day would be 67 hours.
- Route 18 (info attached): The problem with the current route was that it had too far to go between STP and WTP, and not enough to do it. There were safety issues involved. Passengers were yelling at the drivers to make the transfers and the buses were coming in a few minutes late disgorging people who were running across the transfer point to catch their bus.
- Plan B would unhook the Route 18 from the two transfer points at 4-6 PM during the PM peak, when problems were at their worst with traffic and loads.
- Instead of 25-30 minutes between the TP's, there would be 40 minutes, which would make the trip do-able pretty much all the time.
- The down side would be that riders would be missing transfers. This would not be an issue at the WTP where a few buses would be present at arrival times, but the STP would be empty at the off-ticks. This may be an issue; they weren't sure how Police would feel about this. There was a lot of walk-in/walk-out traffic here.
- Plan B gave up the false hope that buses would make it to the TP's in time for riders to make their transfers.
- With Plan A, the idea was to shorten segments of the route. The "Red Dot Map" (attached) showed the predominance of ridership on Allied vs. the Crescent/Red Arrow loop. Plan A would operate all the time on Allied-Chalet Gardens area. Currently, half the buses did this, and half the buses went down Crescent/Red Arrow.

- Route 19 would still travel Crescent/Red Arrow, but wouldn't go out the WTP, but would still go downtown.
- With Plan A, there would be less confusion about which Route 18 was coming through each time. Route 19 would still be on Crescent/Red Arrow. On weekends, Route 59 was there too.
- Per the Allied Loop Map (attached), a big issue for the Route 18's would be coming up next year, when Verona Road construction began. Route 18's doing the "Via Midvale" towards Allied, made a left turn (just south of 12/18) from Verona Road onto the Frontage Road. Next year, this area would be narrowed and there would be fewer through-lanes, trying to handle all of the traffic as well as some sort of ramp system to get up on the Beltline.
- The effort here would be to maximize the flow inbound on Verona Road, which would shorten the turn phase of the signal for buses trying to make the left turn. A big stack of traffic (traveling south) was liable to happen at the left turn. The same thing would happen as buses were coming out from the Frontage Road.
- Staff was thinking that the only way to mitigate the problem would be to have buses travel further down to the turn into Chalet Gardens. And once the reconstruction was complete, there would be a "jug handle" pattern with a traffic circle, which would add a minute or two to travel time.
- Part of the reconstruction involved work on the Britta/Frontage Road between Seminole and Allied, which would be starting this July, adding another layer of complexity.
- For the next 2-3 years during the entire project, they would be juggling "vias" and detours. Because of the delays and detours, this might be an argument for keeping the Route 18 on Allied all the time, so people weren't wondering which "via" was coming when.
- Currently, the "Raymond Via" traveled along Allied and Chalet Gardens; and the "Midvale Via" used the turn at the Frontage Road (just south of 12/18) and travel along Allied and Crescent/Red Arrow.
- The Owl Creek Route 31 schedule (attached) would operate on weekdays in the AM-PM peaks, supplementing service from the neighborhood to the schools by adding to the choices students would have to get to school earlier or stay later after school. A group of LaFollette students from the neighborhood said they were ecstatic about the new route. On weekends, it ran throughout the day, but started later at 9:37 AM and ran to 7 PM, which allowed them to get to/from school but also to the ETP and the rest of the system, and opened up possibilities for weekend employment.

Kamp explained that the reason staff respectfully recommended Plan A had to do with the Verona Road construction, and the extra time it took to travel Crescent/Red Arrow and 20-30% of transfers not being made, and drivers expressing frustration about not being able to help customers get to the TP's. Kamp clarified that Fitchburg and Alder Cheeks supported Plan B as shown.

Bergamini/Golden made a motion to approve the service changes recommended by staff, except for Route 18, for which they moved to approve Plan B.

Members discussed the proposals, and staff answered questions.

- (Bergamini) Route 18 Plan didn't just involve Madison territory, but also crossed over into Fitchburg, the City of Fitchburg approved Plan B. If they were to approve Plan A, a plan their partner didn't want, they would likely have to go into negotiations with Fitchburg. While she understood staff's concerns,

having observed how road construction worked, all of this would probably be fiction and she didn't want to spend time arguing about it.

- (Golden) Why not have two different route numbers for the two Route 18 "vias", since they seemed to cover different routes west of Allied?
- (Beck) People had come to terms with Rt. 18 being a varied route and knew it very well the way it was. The rationale originally was that they were both connectors between STP and WTP, and served the same function. Changing the numbers would mean changes to all the bus stops, all the programming that went into buses, which would be a monumental effort.
- (Rusch) When riders used Google Trip Planner, it spit out all the info. They were using fewer and fewer Ride Guides. After 10-12 years, there would be chaos explaining the change.
- (Schmidt) While he understood concerns, he was not a fan of Plan B, and staff perspective was more persuasive to him. He wasn't worried about Fitchburg in the sense that they were looking for some savings and they found them. And now, they would still get the same service level with Plan B? For some of their constituents, he could see why they would prefer Plan B, but people should remember they also wanted to cut \$4,000, which didn't seem to nearly pay for what they were getting or were willing to give up. Route 18 had been a problem. They needed more buses. Route 18 was probably the highest priority. He was afraid Plan B would damage the route.
- (Poulson) Though unlikely to vote, the reason he broke the tie on the vote for selective fare increases, was not just because of Owl Creek, but because of the situations with Route 2 and Route 18. Route 18 was a real problem, which wasn't going to go away. As a former alder of that neighborhood, all the service he (and all subsequent alders) could get there was very important to them. But the fact that people were missing their transfers was critical. We needed to hang on to existing customers, by not having a bus pass them up in January, or by ensuring they could make their transfers to maybe get to a job on time. Because of the issue of transfers, he supported Plan A, reluctantly, because he would love to have service on both roads.
- (Bergamini) People liked Plan B because it kept service and stops in locations where they wanted them, even if it meant cutting a trip. No one was thrilled about messing up the timing for transfers, but buses weren't making 20-30% of the transfers now. And as soon as construction began, everything would go out the window.
- (Schmidt) He didn't disagree, but was concerned about the transfer issue. And it was frustrating that they had gone to so much effort to improve Route 18, and now they would be cutting out a run. Route 18 should be a priority. For the Council moving forward with enhancements, that part of town and the Route 18 in particular needed their attention.
- (Beck) With Plan B, the longer loop would continue all day long every day of the week, with no time savings. He was particularly concerned about continuing the turn at the Frontage Road.
- (Kamp/Beck) With Plan B, the South Transfer Point would have more problems with transfers (than the WTP); people would have to wait 10-20 minutes between 4:30 and 5:30 PM. The West Transfer Point had more buses at the Plan B arrival times: Routes 67, Route 2.
- (Kamp) Fitchburg cut their budget, but they preferred to cut Routes 44, 47 and some individual trip cuts, vs. changing Route 18. Staff recommended that if they were cutting money and needed to save money, they should change Route 18. But staff understood clearly that Fitchburg disagreed with them.
- (Bergamini) She expressed frustration with the process. They had originally voted on fares to deal with overcrowding on Route 2 and give service to Owl

Creek. What they were given was a proposal to 15 other routes as well, which in some cases seemed not to have much to do with Rts. 2 and 31. In the opening section of the first draft, the Overview said that their scheduling and map and needed a thorough overhaul. The proposal was a lot different than the product she expected, based on what the Council and the Commission had approved. It had not been easy to explain or understand. If the Commission needed to take a look at everything, staff needed to tell them that, not as a parenthetical as it almost was in draft 1. What they had felt like piecemeal change and tweaking, which she empowered staff to do. She wanted the Commission to deal with major service changes. The direction the Commission had given was to fix the western end of Route 2, and to develop the Route 31. She would vote in favor of the service changes, but she was not happy with the process.

- (Golden) He disagreed, and had a different view of what was going on. When the Council acted, they provided some extra money to do some specific things, esp. Owl Creek. However, periodically, they looked at how the system was performing, and beyond the budget, made adjustments if they found problems. This was a fairly typical package of adjustments that needed to be made. The TDP had many pages of suggested enhancements to move to a better system. With the current proposal, they would now be serving Grandview Commons, and he was happy about that. Also, the information was the best he had ever received. Also, being attentive to the elected official for the area, he was supporting Plan B. He knew it was a trade-off, and they were doing the best they could with the resources they had. They needed to convey the message that they needed another bus.

- (Schmidt) The construction on Verona Road was likely to force them to add another bus. Though space wasn't now available, they needed more rolling stock.

- (Bergamini) They also needed DOT to be cooperative about adaptations during construction, to time the lights to facilitate bus movements.

Alder Cheeks reiterated his support of Plan B. He appreciated that staff had taken the time to prepare Plan B. As they approached construction season, it was hard to predict if either plan would be very successful. He understood that staff felt Plan A would have a greater likelihood of success. The issue they faced was that the current route was not reliable. It was also a tragedy that the current Route 18 only served Crescent/Red Arrow half of the time in the first place. It should be serving the community all of the time. By his estimation and in agreement with Fitchburg and the neighborhood, the community was more concerned with maintaining inadequate service than with trying to maintain the schedule they were accustomed to. While he respected staff's confidence in Plan A, the community was speaking loudly that they wanted to receive service in a particular way and wasn't interested in being told what was potentially better, if more inconvenient. The more inconvenient outweighed the potentially better, for the community. In a community where public transportation was essential for most people to get around the city at all, he thought it important for the Commission consider that seriously.

A vote was taken on the motion. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**H. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - for information only
(Most recent meeting minutes attached, if available)**

[07828](#)

ADA Transit Subcommittee

Contracted Service Oversight Subcommittee
Parking Council for People with Disabilities
Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission
State Street Design Project Oversight Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)
Judge Doyle Square Committee
Bus Size Steering Committee

No action was needed on these items.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- I.1. General announcements by Chair (Verbal announcements, for information only)

Poulson read a letter from Susan Schmitz to the TPC regarding her departure (attached). He also mentioned the vacancies on State Street Design, LRTPC, ADATS and Parking Council for People with Disabilities, and invited members to consider serving on these.

[30497](#)

May 6, 2013 Schmitz Letter to TPC - TPC 05.29.13

- I.2. Commission member items for future agendas - None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by Ellingson, to Adjourn at 7:51 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.